

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-50 are pending in the application. The Office has rejected claims 1-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 stating that they “disclose a claimed invention that is an abstract idea and not technologically embodied.” Further the Office has rejected claims 1-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,185,557 to Liu.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Office has rejected claims 1, 18 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 stating that they are “not technologically embodied.” Claim 1, as currently amended, recites “a computer-implemented method for use in joining two value-ordered primary index tables T1 and T2 in a database system.” As a result, claim 1 now recites a computerized process that produces the concrete, tangible and useful result of joining two tables in a database system. Claim 1 and its dependents are therefore statutory under 35 U.S.C. § 101 (*see, e.g.*, MPEP § 2106 (IV)(B)(2)(b)).

Applicant’s claim 18, as originally written, recites a “database system for joining two value-ordered primary index tables,” where the database system has several structural elements, including “one or more nodes,” a “plurality of CPUs,” a “plurality of virtual processes,” and a “reading join component,” where the reading join component is configured to perform a database table join process. Applicant does not understand how the Office could possibly allege that such a system is not “technologically embodied.” Applicant feels, in fact, that the invention could not possibly be any more technologically embodied than it is in this claim. What’s more, the database system of claim 18 is used to perform the concrete, tangible, and useful result of joining value-ordered tables that reside in the system. As a result, Applicant submits that claim 18 does indeed recite statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101, as do claims 19-33, which depend from it (*see, e.g.*, MPEP § 2106 (IV)(B)(2)(b)).

Likewise, Applicant's claim 34, as originally written, recites a "computer program, stored in a tangible medium, for joining two value-ordered primary index tables." As such, claim 34 involves more than a "manipulation of an abstract idea," as stated by the Office. Rather, claim 34 comprises functional descriptive material recorded on computer-readable medium which permits the function of the descriptive material, namely the joining of two database tables, to be realized. As a result, claim 34 and its dependents are also statutory under 35 U.S.C. § 101 (*see, e.g.*, MPEP § 2106 (IV)(B)(1)).

The § 102(e) Rejection in view of Liu

Regarding Applicant's claims 1, 18 and 34, Liu does not teach or suggest "**recording** a lack of a match" when no match exists between the loaded row(s) of a first table and a loaded row of second table, as required Applicant (emphasis added). Rather Liu teaches to "**discard** [the] outer record" and then read "another row from the first table" when no match is found between records from a first and second table (*see, e.g.*, Liu, Figure 2, and col. 2, lines 46-49) (emphasis added). A person of ordinary skill in the art would readily understand that **recording** the lack of a match among rows of two database tables is not at all the same thing as **discarding** the record from an outer table when no match is found. Therefore, as Liu does not teach or even suggest all the elements of Applicant's claims 1, 18 and 34, these claims and their dependents are patentable over Liu.

Conclusions

Applicant has respectfully traversed the Office's 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejections. Further, and for the reasons discussed above, as Liu does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of any of Applicant's claims, all of Applicant's claims are allowable over this reference. Applicant therefore asks the Office to reconsider this application and allow all of the claims. Please apply any charges that might be due, excepting the issue fee but including fees for extensions of time, to deposit account 14-0225.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John D. Cowart", written over a horizontal line.

John D. Cowart
Reg. No. 38,415

NCR Corporation
1700 South Patterson Blvd.
Dayton, Ohio 45479-0001

Tel. No. (858) 485-4903
Fax No. (858) 485-3255